

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are submitted responsive to the Office Action dated May 31, 2007 (Office Action). As this response is timely filed before the expiration of the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. However, the Examiner is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

In the Office Action, Claim 9 was objected to due to informalities. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 12, 13, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,818,920 to Rignell, *et al.* (hereinafter Rignell), in view of U.S. Patent 6,574,486 to Labban (hereinafter Labban), and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,934,543 to Wang, *et al.* (hereinafter Wang). Claim 16, 18, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rignell, in view of Wang. Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rignell, in view of Wang, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,075,992 to Moon, *et al.* (hereinafter Moon).

Objections to the Claims

As noted below, the claims have been amended to define over the cited references. Applicants note that the claims reflect Applicants' intended amendments for the response of April 25, 2007 and the current amendments. The term "originating source" is no longer included in Claim 9 or elsewhere. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the present objections.

Amendments to the Claims

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections, Applicants nonetheless have amended the claims in order to expedite prosecution of the present application by further emphasizing certain aspects of the claims. Applicants respectfully assert, however, that the claim amendments presented should not be interpreted as the surrender of any subject matter. Applicants are not conceding by these amendments that

any previously submitted claims are not patentable over the references of record. Applicants' present claim amendments are submitted only for purposes of facilitating expeditious prosecution of the present Application. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue any previously submitted claims in one or more continuation and/or divisional patent applications.

In this response, Applicants have amended each of the independent claims to emphasize certain aspects of the claims. In particular, the independent claims now recite the limitation that local information includes a current location of the recipient's handheld device. Furthermore, the independent claims also recite the limitation that prior to displaying the local information to the sending party, it is determined whether current location information should be displayed. New Claims 21 and 22 are also presented, the newly-presented claims reciting the limitation that the determination of whether to display the current location information can be based on prompting the sending party or a preference of the sending party for displaying local information. Such amendments are fully supported throughout the Specification. (See, e.g., p. 9, lines 1-21.) No new subject matter has been introduced by these amendments.

The Claims Define Over the Cited References

In the Office Action, independent Claims 1, 4, 8, 9, and 12 were rejected as being unpatentable over Rignell in view of Labban and Wang. Claim 16 was rejected as being unpatentable over Rignell in view of Wang. Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections. However, in view of the additional limitations in the independent claims, Applicants respectfully submit that the current rejections are now moot and that the independent claims, as amended, now define over the references of record.

In particular, Rignell, Labban, and Wang fail to disclose or suggest the step of determining a current location of the receiving handheld device and determining whether

to display the current location information to the sending party. Rignell and Wang only disclose methods for providing local time information and providing notification that a user is currently unavailable or that the call time is inconvenient. Labban only discloses text messaging. Nowhere does Rignell or Wang disclose or suggest that the local information to be provided to a sending party would include the actual location information of the recipient's handheld device. As such, Rignell and Wang necessarily also fail to disclose the step of determining whether to display such current location information to the sending party.

In contrast, the independent claims, as amended, now recite the limitation that not only is current location for the recipient's handheld device retrieved, but also that prior to displaying local information to the sending party, a determination can be made as to whether to display the current location information to the sending party. Such a configuration is advantageous as the local information to the caller can be limited to only that needed to make a basic determination of whether or not to mark a message as urgent.

Accordingly, Rignell, Wang, and Labban fail to disclose, suggest, or render obvious each and every limitation of the independent claims, as amended. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the independent claims, as amended, now define over the references of record. Furthermore, as each of the remaining claims depends from one for the independent claims while reciting additional features, Applicants respectfully submit that the dependent claims also define over the references of record.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the

U.S. Patent Appln. No. 09/919,391
Amendment Dated August 31, 2007
Reply to Office Action of May 31, 2007
Docket No. BOC9-2000-0084 (219)

Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 31, 2007



Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652
Eduardo Quinones, Registration No. 58,575
AKERMAN SENTERFITT
Customer No. 40987
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (561) 653-5000